

SCOTT N. SCHOOLS (SCBN 9990)  
United States Attorney

MARK L. KROTOSKI (CSBN 138549)  
Chief, Criminal Division

JULIE A. ARBUCKLE (CSBN 193425)  
Assistant United States Attorney

450 Golden Gate Avenue, Box 36055  
San Francisco, California 94102  
Telephone: (415) 436-7102  
Facsimile: (415) 436-7234

Attorneys for the United States of America

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	)	No. 3 07 70263 EDL
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	STIPULATION AND <del>PROPOSED</del>
	)	ORDER EXCLUDING TIME
v.	)	
	)	
MALEKA MAY,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

On May 7, 2007, the parties in this case appeared before the Court and stipulated that time should be excluded from the calculations under the Speedy Trial Act and Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 5.1 from May 7, 2007 to May 24, 2007 for effective preparation of counsel, in that defense counsel required adequate time to obtain and review information and discovery relevant to the charges in this case. The parties represented that there is good cause for granting the continuance, and that it was the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation of defense counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(B)(iv). The parties also agreed that the ends of justice served by such a continuance outweighed the best

///

interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A).

SO STIPULATED:

SCOTT N. SCHOOLS  
United States Attorney

DATED: May 10, 2007

/s/  
JULIE A. ARBUCKLE  
Assistant United States Attorney

DATED: May 11, 2007

/s/  
William Goodman  
Attorney for Defendant Maleka May,  
Appearing Specially

As the Court found on May 7, 2007, and for the reasons stated above, the Court finds that the ends of justice served by the continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial and that time should be excluded from the calculations under the Speedy Trial Act and Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 5.1 from May 7, 2007 to May 24, 2007 for good cause and the effective preparation of defense counsel. See 18 U.S.C. §3161 (h)(8)(A). The failure to grant the requested continuance would deny counsel reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence, and would result in a miscarriage of justice. See 18 U.S.C. §3161(h)(8)(B)(iv).

SO ORDERED.

DATED: May 14, 2007

Elizabeth D. Laporte  
United States  
IT IS SO ORDERED  
Elijah D. Laporte  
Judge Elizabeth D. Laporte

